

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

**ACCOMMODATION AND VERGENCE FACILITY OF
DIFFERENT LEVEL VISUAL COMPLAINTS BASED
ON REFRACTIVE ERROR GROUPS**

AMIRUL HAKIM BIN ESA

**BACHELOR OF OPTOMETRY (HONS.)
FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES**

JULY 2016

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this study is considerably my own, and to the extent that any part of this work is not my own, I have indicated that it is not mine by a fully acknowledgement in accordance with the standard referring practices of the discipline.

I, hereby, acknowledge that I have been supplied with the Academic Rules and Regulations for Post Graduate, University Teknologi Mara (UiTM) regulating the conduct of my study and research.

Name of Student : Amirul Hakim Bin Esa

Student I.D. No : 2012849108

Program : Bachelor of Optometry

Faculty : Health Science

Thesis : Accommodation and Vergence Facility of Different Level
Visual Complaint and Refractive Error Groups

Signature of Student : 

Date :

ABSTRACT

ACCOMMODATION AND VERGENCE FACILITY OF DIFFERENT LEVEL VISUAL COMPLAINTS BASED ON REFRACTIVE ERROR GROUPS

Purpose: To compare the monocular accommodation facility (MAF), binocular accommodation facility (BAF) and vergence facility (VF) among low and moderate visual complaint condition between myopic and emmetropic subject. **Methods:** Fifty-two subjects (19-35 years old) with 6/6 vision at distance, N5 for near visual acuity, and no history ocular disease participated in the study. Subjects need to answer the survey “Visual Discomfort” by Conlon et al to determine the level of visual complaint. Subjects were classified based on refractive error group before proceeding to next assessment. The monocular accommodation facility (MAF), binocular accommodation facility (BAF) and vergence facility was measured and recorded in cycle per minute (cpm). **Results:** The result in Kruskal-Wallis test showed no significance difference on MAF ($p = 0.382$), BAF ($p = 0.357$) and vergence facility ($p = 0.689$) in different level of visual complaint and MAF ($p = 0.408$), BAF ($p = 0.221$) and Vergence facility ($p = 0.412$) between myopes and emmetropes. **Conclusion:** Thus, subject with different level of visual complaint and refractive error groups had no statistically different on accommodation facility and vergence facility as proposed by the result of current study.

Keywords: Accommodation facility, Vergence facility, Visual complaints.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHOR’S DECLARATION	ii
SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLE	vii
LIST OF FIGURE	viii
LIST OF EQUATION	ix
LIST OF SYMBOL	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	2
1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY	3
1.4 OBJECTIVES	4
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTION	4
1.6 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS	4
LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 INTRODUCTION	5
2.2 ACCOMMODATION AND VERGENCE IN VISUAL COMPLAINT AND REFRACTIVE ERROR GROUPS	6
2.3 ACCOMMODATION AND VERGENCE FACILITY IN VISUAL COMPLAINT CONDITION	7
2.4 ACCOMMODATION AND VERGENCE FACILITY IN REFRACTIVE ERROR GROUP	8
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	10
3.1 OVERVIEW	10
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN	10
3.3 SAMPLE SIZE	10
3.4 PILOT STUDY	11
3.5 SETUP	12
3.5.1 Screening Procedure	13

3.5.2	Experimental Procedure	15
3.5.3	RESEARCH FLOW	15
3.6	INCLUSION CRITERIA	16
3.7	EXCLUSION CRITERIA	17
3.8	EXPECTED FINDING	17
3.9	DATA ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS	17
RESULTS		18
4.1	INITIAL STUDY AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	18
4.1.1	Comparison between Monocular Accommodation Facility in right eye and left eye	20
4.2	DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	21
4.2.1	Mean and standard deviation of measurement test	21
4.2.2	Median and interquartile range of test measurement	21
4.2.3	Normality test	23
4.2.4	Level of visual complaint	24
4.2.5	Level of visual complaint in different refractive error group	25
4.3	INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS	26
4.3.1	MAF, BAF, and VF in refractive error group	26
4.3.2	MAF, BAF and VF in different level of visual complaint	27
4.3.3	MAF, BAF, and VF in different complaint based on refractive error group	29
DISCUSSION		32
5.1	MAF, BAF, and VF among low and moderate visual complaint condition between myopes and emmetropes.	32
5.2	Comparison of accommodation facility and vergence facility in a different level of visual complaint and refractive error group.	33
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION		36
REFERENCES		38
APPENDICES		42